

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

AUTHOR JAMES MANNING, JR.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
CREDIT ONE, et al.,	§	Case No. 6:25-cv-98-JDK-KNM
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	
	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Author James Manning Jr.'s complaint. Docket No. 1. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On April 11, 2025, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that this case be dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Docket No. 2. The Magistrate Judge also recommended that Plaintiff be barred from filing further lawsuits unless such lawsuit is filed by a licensed attorney enrolled to practice in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas. *Id.* A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff. No objections have been received.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law.

Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).


Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 2) as to the determinations that Plaintiff failed to state a claim. Accordingly, Plaintiff's claims are **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

With respect to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation of sanctions, the Court has already imposed the recommended sanctions on Plaintiff. *See Manning v. Sony*, 6:25-cv-101, Docket No. 8 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 22, 2025).

So ordered and signed on this

May 6, 2025


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE